

E 675

,C 87

1872



GRANT OR GREELEY?

♦♦♦

SPEECH OF S. S. COX,

OF NEW-YORK CITY,

ON THE ISSUES OF THE

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

OF 1872.

♦♦♦

"THERE are winds that are sometimes loud and unquiet, and yet, with all the trouble they give us, we owe great part of our health to them. There may be fresh gales of asserting liberty without turning into such storms of hurricane as that the State should run any hazard of being cast away by them."—LORD HALIFAX.

"If thou must needs have thy revenge on thine enemy, with a soft tongue break his bones, heap coals of fire on his head, and enjoy it. To forgive your enemies is a charming way of revenge, laying your enemies at your feet under sorrow, shame, and repentance, leaving your foes your friends and solicitously inclined to grateful retaliations. Common forcible ways make not an end of evil, but leave hatred and malice behind them. An enemy thus reconciled is little to be trusted, as wanting the foundation of love and charity, and but for a time restrained by disadvantage or inability."—SIR THOMAS BROWNE.

♦♦♦

NEW-YORK:

S. W. GREEN, PRINTER, 16 AND 18 JACOB STREET.

—
1872.



1625

SPEECH OF S. S. COX.

At a meeting of the Hickory Club of the Fifteenth Ward of New-York City, on August 30th, 1872, Judge Spencer, presiding, introduced Mr. Cox to his Constituents, when he spoke as follows:

GENTLEMEN AND LADIES:

“Unhappy is that nation which can not redeem itself.” This was the language of the eminent ex-Attorney-General Hoar, of Massachusetts, in bidding the Japanese, at Boston, take instruction from our land. It is just and philosophical. Happy shall we be if we are enabled this fall to follow not only his advice, but the sacred injunction: “Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.”

Need I prove that we have fallen upon evil days, that our time needs redemption?

I am not an indiscriminate praiser of the time past, even in our own history; but I admire the government, in its beautiful proportions and divisions, which our honored ancestry built. They built wiser than they knew. What other polity could have withstood the shock of civil conflict and the demoralization of administration since its termination? If one of the revered architects of our system could appear from his tomb, would he not point with more severity than did “buried Denmark” at the present rottenness in the State? Where is the old simplicity and purity? Are not the teachings of frugality of the great men of even a quarter of a century ago, habitually disregarded? The war is responsible for much reckless and unconscionable conduct. It is the canker which follows war. The insane greed for wealth, the enormous growth of capital, the ill-gotten and even well-gotten wealth, public debts and private speculations, shoddy display and superficial fashion, monopolizing corporations and family greed—the desire to shine in the calcium glare of the present

feverish round of social and political junketing—these are the evidences of a rooted malady, for which the White House and the Cottage by the Sea are no more responsible than is effect responsible for cause.

I will not say that this would have been otherwise had the Democratic Party, under similar circumstances, given the rule to manners and men. Yet it is not without pride that we point to the days when an austere simplicity crowned the characters of Democrats of the Jefferson and Jackson type. We are not a peculiar people. Rome had her Cato ; but she had her Domitian also. The austerity of the one is in great contrast with the frivolity of the other.

MORAL AND POLITICAL REVOLUTION.

I come not here to make either an elegy or a eulogy over Democracy or the past. If the Democracy is dead, or if its works live honorably, it is no time now, with our eyes to the future, and in the light of coming reform, to sing either the one, or speak the other. The time and men have changed ; parties and opinions have changed. It is because there is a necessity for the common weal that compels such changes. No one can deny that we are undergoing a great moral and political reaction. The magnitude of the movement may be denied ; but as in other ages, so in this, there is a class insensible to the revolution. It is none the less a revolution because it does not breathe of sulphur and carnage, or swagger with a sword knot and epaulet. In this revolution bloody laurels are not to be won ; civil chaplets only are to be gathered. Before this progressive revolution, platforms and conventions are as straws on the rail track. Before its edict, the “protest” of all the Treasury and its Secretary against closing the chasm of hate and strife, is like the shriek of an octave flute in a “jubilee” of thunder !

Seven years ago the war ended. During this period the Democratic Party has been reproached for its pertinacious hold of its old tenets. It was not the party of advance. It saw no object till it was passed. These reproaches, whether well or ill-founded, were made by Republicans, anxious to coöperate with the three million of Democrats in a great and honest purpose. Republicans who saw irresponsible administration, no accountability, no earnest sense of duty or devotion to principle, in their own party, thought we were running in ancient ruts—groping in the crypts

of the past. They said to us, "Our party has had its day. It has done its work. It abolished slavery. Its object is attained. Its day of final reckoning on other matters has come! Will you help us?" You know the response. You know the results. Cincinnati joined with Baltimore, and the revolution began. The Democracy may not believe that its party work is altogether done, or that its party bears on its face the image of immortality; but they feel that as a great advancing and a great reserve force—compacted as one, and not counting the inevitable stragglers—they have made amends for many backward and laggard steps, even with the most prejudiced of their enemies, by the acceptance of the Cincinnati movement and the nomination of Mr. Greeley!

THE NEW ALLIANCE.

It is not necessary for me to discuss the question whether the Democracy have undergone a political metempsychosis. Suppose they have been swallowed by Cincinnati—suppose they have sent their old ideas away on a pilgrimage to atone for their past badness—or suppose, on the other hand, that the party exists still and accepts new forms of belief—the question remains, Are these new forms the best for the present and future? No other question is relevant. No sound reasoner will debate aught else. But it is said the sincerity of these new convictions are questioned. If the alleged change in our party is simply that of Proteus, it is a change of shape and not of heart. If that be so, then I admit the party must be tried on its old merits or demerits. Then no regard must be paid to any new alliance, even for a good object. Mr. Dawes is concerned because Liberal Republicans act with the Democracy. He said, "If they labor with it, they labor for it; and the question is, which is to control?" He thought the Democrats would. But this is aside from the issue, and he meant it should be. The question is not—how to reconcile the alliance of free-trade and protection; nor how the unrepentant rebel can, without a lie, support Mr. Greeley. The question of the tariff, like others to be named, is in abeyance, by the nature and terms of the alliance; and the assumption that the rebel is unrepentant is a gratuitous and unfounded assumption. So that when Mr. Dawes cleverly says that the union between Republicans and Democrats for certain pronounced objects is a monster with two bodies and one head, he fails to see the elegant and just proportion of its one head and body. If the Cincinnati platform

with its demands for reform is right and is adopted at Baltimore, I fail to see two heads or two bodies. It is a phalanx, if you please, of two divisions, under one commander, and marching direct to the overthrow of personal administration and to the rescue of civic virtue and public liberty ! It may require more heroism for the Republican to act with his former enemy ; but when he acts for the right, and supports the Democratic nominee at Baltimore, he is a better Democrat than him who only obeys the authority of his party convention ; and the Democrat who supports his old opponent is a better Republican than him who supports the man whose policy undermines the republic !

Suppose this does imply change in Republican and Democrat. If that change works for good administration, civil practices, and would restore affection between the late warring elements, who shall be reluctant to accept such change ?

DEMOCRATIC RECORD.

Suppose in the past we did our best, and failed, shall the ghost of the dead forever haunt the house we have unsubstantially reared in the air ? I have acted with the Democracy since a boy. I love its memories and revere its past. It is hard to believe that our best exertions are ruins, our energies wasted. To me there was nothing so grand as the contest of Jefferson against Federalism, of Madison against English arrogance, of Jackson against capital, or that which was made under Douglas, backed by his 1,375,157 voters in 1860, to keep this country one and indivisible. These patriotic struggles against faction and zealotry are now like the dreams of life's morning, compared with the terrible passions of the life and death-struggle which followed after 1860. But these dreams are cherished, even by our opponents, as something to be proud of. How often do our Republican friends boast of selecting an old Democrat ? Have we as Democrats given up our memories in making new associations ? Because the leaves fall, the birds forget to sing, the sunny skies become darkened, is our history but a breath-stain on a mirror, or moonlight on the water ? Is the influence of our glorious recollections unsubstantial and fleeting ? Never from my lip shall reproaches fall upon that past we once cherished as Democrats when bound up by our party ties in one bundle of national life, with our brethren of every section ! Nor is it necessary, in forming new relations, that such incentives should be obliterated.

Some of those most anxious for the preservation of Democracy have not been with it so long as some of us, who have given an undeviating life to its fortunes. If we can say now of our party that

“ Much must be borne which it is hard to bear,
Much given away which it were sweet to keep,”

those of our party who are less faithful might pardon the infirmity of those who, in endeavoring to save the country now, are willing to make some sacrifices of pride and self-love.

But I am done with sentiment. I have no repining at our present condition. As a party, accepting the clasp of honest men of another party, we become with them a cohort, which dares to progress and change.

The very sun itself, the source of light and heat, is changing even the hues of its light. Ever consuming, ever relumining, its substances are in perpetual change. The analysis of stars by the spectroscope, the processes of star-gauging and star-motions, show that there may be a diminution or increase to the great fire and lamp of our system through the lapse of time. So it is with parties and opinions. The orb of our political system may undergo mutation and temporary eclipse, but it remains to us still, and under better conditions. It is strengthened and brightened even by the changes it undergoes.

CHARGES OF INCONSISTENCY.

Why should Democrats be charged with desertion of their tenets and truths because they recognize accomplished facts? facts accomplished, it may be, without their sanction or administration? Is it not permitted our party to advance? Are we to be forever charged as Bourbons and boors, who sit in the car and see only what is passed? The three amendments, enlarged suffrage and new elements of mutual regard between the sections, are these to be ignored by our party, because our regards are fixed on our own proud monuments? or our opponents taunt us with inconsistency in accepting the irrevocable?

When a great reform took place in England by the repeal of the Corn Laws, the party of Cobden, Bright, Villiers, and Elliott received the fresh accession of Peel, Graham, and Gladstone. Read the great debate. It is full of heroic defiance of all charges of inconsistency.

Lord George Bentinck had read Sir James Graham's former speeches against repeal. In Hansard's Debates, (3d sec., vol. 85, p. 161,) while expressing his charity for those who were consistently wrong, he said,

"When I made up my mind, under a deep sense of public duty, to act in concert with my right honorable friend at the head of the government, and, upon considerations of public necessity, as it appeared to me, to present this *measure to Parliament*, as a servant of the crown, I anticipated, and I foresaw with pain, all that has taken place on the present occasion with reference to the conduct of honorable members on this side of the House. I counted the cost of the sacrifice which necessity and sense of duty compelled me to make. I was prepared, and I am prepared on public grounds, regardless of all taunts, regardless of all obloquy which may be heaped upon me, acting from a deep sense of what is due to the public, to set aside all personal considerations, and join in the advocacy of a measure which, in my conscience, I believe to be necessary for the public good. . . . I have often expressed a hope, and I now again with unaffected sincerity express it, that the day will soon come when these gentlemen will see that we have not betrayed them, and admit that the course which we have taken is that which was best calculated to promote their interests, and those of the country at large."

To-day, in all the realm of Great Britain, there is no one to doubt the wisdom of that wise reform.

The great premier, Sir Robert Peel, was not less defiant or prophetic on the 22d January, 1846, (Hansard, 3d sec., vol. 83, p. 69 :)

"I will not withhold the homage which is due to the progress of reason and to truth, by denying that my opinions on the subject of protection have undergone a change. Whether holding a private station, or placed in a public one, I will assert the privilege of yielding to the force of argument and conviction, and acting upon the results of enlarged experience. It may be supposed that there is something humiliating in making such admissions ; sir, I feel no such humiliation. I have not so much confidence in the capacity of man, to determine what is right or wrong intuitively, as to make me feel abashed at admitting that I have been in error. I should feel humiliation if, having modified or changed my opinions, I declined to acknowledge the change for fear of incurring the imputation of inconsistency. The question is whether the facts are sufficient to account for the change, and the motives for it are pure and disinterested. Nothing could be more base on the part of a public man, than to protect himself from danger by pretending a change of opinion ; or more inconsistent with the duty he owes to his sovereign and country, than if, seeing reason to alter his course, he forbore to make the alteration by the fear of being taunted with a charge of inconsistency. The real question, as I have said, is whether the motives for the modification of opinion are sufficient and sincere.

"My opinions have been modified by the experience of the last three

years. I have the means and opportunity of comparing the results of periods of abundance and low prices. I have carefully watched the effects of the one system and of the other—first, of the policy we have been steadily pursuing for some years, namely, the removal of protection from domestic industry; and next, of the policy which the friends of protection recommend. I have also had an opportunity of marking from day to day the effect upon great social interests of freedom of trade and comparative abundance. I have not failed to note the results of preceding years, and to contrast them with the results of the last three years; and I am led to the conclusion that the main grounds of public policy on which protection has been defended are not tenable; at least I can not maintain them."

Irrespective of the merits of that vexed controversy, one can not but admire the heroic quality which was exhibited in England by her great men in 1846. Nor is England alone. What has led the fathers of the Republican Party—the Chases, Adamses, Blairs, Trumbulls, Schurzes, Bankses, and Greeleys—to join hands with their inveterate opponents except that proud consciousness of just and patriotic motive, which knew no fear when taunted with a charge of inconsistency!

Nor does such a union deny to each and all the full liberty to act on matters not in the agreement. Minor objects are ignored with a view to essential and great objects. Those greater objects can only be attained by concession and union. The autonomy of our States, the return to "home rule," the reconciliation of sections, and the preservation of constitutional limits in administration and legislation are greater than fiscal affairs or party consistency. Government itself can not be framed without such a philosophy. Are individual opinions and party views to impede the onrolling car of progress and reform? When good administration is demanded by an indignant and outraged people, great efforts *will be made* to overcome the varieties of thought and action on subordinate matters. How else can we rescue the nation from peril? How else can a nation reform itself when the "days are evil"?

DEMOCRATIC STRENGTH AND GENEROSITY.

In pursuing this philosophy, and in the hour of our increasing strength, the Democracy have shown a magnanimity unknown to its sordid and selfish opponents. With a reasonable hope of success at this election, it elects to be more patriotic than partisan. Lest its enemy should again attain control—for fear the encroachments upon personal liberty, federal concord, and local

government should be continued for another term of the present incumbent—the Democracy have resolved to make its host the reserve of a band of liberal and honest Republicans. They do this without any intent or with the effect to destroy its own honored and compact organization. That organization exists in every town, county, city, and State. It was before us in the grand convocation of all the States at Baltimore. It is vital with the forces of tradition, history, reason, patriotism, and freedom; and no acceptance of new and true principles, and no nomination of an old-time opponent can weaken those forces.

In the hour of our increasing strength, we make this sacrifice of party pride. Since Mr. Lincoln was elected by about thirty per cent of the 4,680,193 votes in 1860, we have suffered two Presidential disasters. Yet General McClellan received within five per cent of the majority of the popular vote in 1864; and Horatio Seymour, in 1868, forty-seven per cent of the 5,716,788. Since that time, we have doubled our representation in the federal Congress. In this hour of hope and growth, to make it beyond possibility of failure, we raise our banner with no strange device, but place it in the hands of one who has hitherto been a stranger to its folds.

Yet I will not deny there is a certain pride in consistent thought and conduct. The youth who always coquettes seldom weds. It shows infirmity to change suddenly, even for good reasons; and something worse, for selfish motives. While ever a Democrat from earliest years; while ever voting and aiding the union of these States upon the basis of the constitution and the rights of the States; while beginning with Douglas and, if you please, ending with Greeley, our last Democratic national nominee, I have never lost that love, partly inherited, but ever hopeful and faithful, for the Democracy,—I am not insensible to the fact that good men have left my party and bad men have come to it; that good men have returned to it again and bad men have left it, and that in the mutations of popular governments these changes may, do, and must ensue. Many, nay, most of them, are made upon the purest love of country and desire for its welfare. It requires something of heroic effort to do as Peel and Graham did in England in 1846, when they reversed a lifetime of politics to give England the cheap loaf—a free breakfast, dinner, and supper-table!

Had there been in England then a lyrical doctor, like our own

Dr. Holmes, he might have sung about Whig and Tory who joined in the great economic reform, the same humorous jingle he sang to the Japanese the other day :

“ To be sure there is always a bit of row,
When we choose our tycoon, and especially now ;
For things are so mixed, how's a fellow to know,
What party he's of, and what vote he shall throw.
White's getting so black, and black's getting so white,
Republic—rat, Dem—ican, can't get 'em right ! ”

Perhaps the most conspicuous zany to-day in American politics, if indeed he survives the fool-killer, is the man who would desert the Liberal Republican platform, simply because the Democrats accepted it. A man who believes the truth because his pastor says it is true, is as much of a heretic, said Milton, as he who believes a falsehood. He who rejects the truth because others accept it—well, there is no name to express the imbecility of his intellect. When Horace Greeley says water runs down hill, it runs just so ; but if Horatio Seymour acquiesces in the idea, it is awful—it runs up !

This is almost equal to another reason urged against the new movement. It is this : “ Republicans should not accept the movement, because former rebels and Democrats not rebels join in it.” That is to say, “ Douglas men and Breckinridge men, men of revolt and men of allegiance, accept the verdict of Peace as the fiat of Force. Therefore ”—the *non sequitur* is thus propounded to Republicans—“ let us all join in fighting over again the battles of force on platform and in Congress.”

Is this sensible ? What need of saltpetre in Congress ? Even in the tariff it is a fraud. What need of guns in the cabinet ? Even in the War Department, and its contracts, it is not—good. Where is the necessity of the red hand to draft the enactments of deliberation ? It is a curious illustration of political logic. Think of it ! Peace give us guns and dragoons ! It is about as sensible as that civil service reform which gives us Casey inside and syndicates outside the Treasury ; or that administration which allows Leet to levy on merchants to liberalize commerce, and Stocking to make contracts to save cartman competition ; or that allows Scott and Reed to ruin States to illustrate executive purity and local government ; and Grant to pay off the national debt at Long Branch, with Boutwell at Grafton, with the taxes of people who are not reveling at ease, but producing the means wherewith to pay.

But it is said, sometimes with good temper and sometimes sneeringly, that we are inconsistent; that we play an ignoble part. Inconsistent to take the truths of a decent and noble policy in the Cincinnati platform! Inconsistent in selecting a candidate dedicated to them heart and soul! Inconsistent because we love our land, the form and structure of our government, and the genius that should guide us in our great future! If it be inconsistent to be devoted and patriotic, let there be more of it, and the abuses of power will stop and the blessings of liberty will be ours!

“TU QUOQUE!”

The worst that can be said of us is what history has written of every party—it has made a coalition with a portion of its opponents. The virtue or vice of such a coalescence consists in its purpose. It is nothing new upon the rolls of party action, to find the most incongruous elements and names associated to promote one great object. Again, I say, why, when seeking good ends by the union of good men of both parties, are we especially to be taunted with insincere or unworthy charges. Does it lie in the mouth of Mr. Morton, who disavored negro suffrage during the war, to taunt Thomas Jefferson Randolph for accepting it in 1872? Does it become General Cameron, General Butler, old Democrats, who disavored in 1856 the interference with slavery in the States, to taunt us with accepting the amendment abolishing it? Is it forgotten, that in 1861—not by me, I am sure, for I was in Congress voting for every compromise to secure union and avert war—that Governor Corwin’s Committee reported, as a measure of conciliation, an amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the “people” to abolish slavery? I voted for it, as a measure of healing and union, though I asserted the right of the people to amend the Constitution or to amend its amendments at their sovereign will. Who voted with me? Colfax, Logan, Sickles, McPherson, Maynard, and a host of other men now devoted to Grant. Who is General Dix, that the convention which nominated him should make charges of changes, insincere and unpatriotic? A Democrat, a Republican, a Johnson man, a Grant man, a what is it, boxing every part of the political compass? And there is the acute lawyer and gentleman, Mr. Tremain. Where was he but a few years; nay, a few months ago? Fighting against coercing secession. He said then that Mr. Murphy’s appointment was not “nice statesmanship,” and denounced

the rottenness of the administration he is now bound to uphold, as the nominee "at large" for Congress.

I think it does not become any one belonging to so mosaic a party to be anxious about Democratic consistency. The changes which have taken place in our own politics are enough to startle the timid, though to the philosophic mind they are not new revelations of human experience. I can remember in my first Congress, in 1857, that even Joshua R. Giddings, when I pressed him in debate on negro suffrage, refused to declare for it. The formation of the Republican Party was strong in 1860, because it had a plank in its platform in favor of local government. Here it is:

4. "That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the rights of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the greatest of crimes."

Who now adheres to this? Governor Blair, of Michigan; Governor Gratz Brown, of Missouri; Governor Fenton, of New-York, and Governor Chamberlain, of Maine; Montgomery Blair, Governor Chase, Judge Trumbull, and the rest; or the inconsequential men who arraign them for its betrayal? During the vicissitudes of the war, under new conditions made by the war, Northern non-coercionists became soldiers of the Federal army, and Union men became secessionists. Even Quakers became belligerents, and John Brown's body, though mouldering, fought to the death in song for the triumph of law against rebellion. If his body were now marching on earth with Wendell Phillips and General Grant, it would be, I suppose, against Greeley, flanked by Mosby as a warrior and Ackerman and Settle as civilians. Many who in 1861 took up the old flag, like Colonel Ulysses Grant, of the 21st Illinois, were ready to riddle it with bullets if the object of the war was perverted to abolitionism. The same gallant officer, when he was properly promoted to be a general, considered the attempt to force negro suffrage on the States as an "unwise attempt." Is it necessary to impute insincerity to General Grant for his changes of opinion? When in Congress, I helped to draft the "Border State" and Crittenden resolutions, defining the object of the war, I never dreamed then that I could

ever vote more money and men—after the war, by the persistency of the South, had been prolonged and changed into an anti-slavery crusade as its chief impulse; but I did vote money and men. I believed with Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Weed that, with or without slavery, the Union—the Union was the great central idea. Certainly when I ran against Horace Greeley for the honors of the Sixth Congressional District of New-York City, I did not dream that his efforts for amnesty, the paramount thought with me, would ever make him forget for a time “protection.” He refers the question to the people in their districts voting and in Congress assembled. Who will declare that Horace Greeley, at Niagara, seeking peace with Union, under Mr. Lincoln’s advice and countenance, was not an honorable friend of our government? He who denies it, must consider General Grant a slave-driver, for his order of August 11th, 1862, at Corinth, Mississippi, against enticing slaves from their masters. Do you complain of the theories of politicians? If so, what becomes of Mr. Beecher’s idea, of “no State except in the Union”—of the denunciation of Thaddeus Stevens’s State suicide, afterwards accepted by the reconstructionists; or, if in the domain of economy, what becomes of Mr. Boutwell’s idea that competition and publicity should be given in placing the public loan, and where would Cooke, Clews & Co. be if Mr. Boutwell were consistent? Or perhaps Mr. Boutwell might be allowed to make a new statement of the payment of the public debt, so as to confirm his statement in Congress that Johnson had paid off 33 per cent more per annum than himself. Where would be Mr. Dawes, who joined with me in keeping out bogus Congressmen at the beginning of the war, and filling the places at once with representatives without reconstruction?

Must Saul forever remain Saul, even after the scales have fallen from his sight? May not the persecutor Saul become the Christian Apostle Paul, without reproach?

But, above all, it does not become Senator Conkling, who, but a year or so ago, long after Mr. Greeley’s record was the subject of general knowledge and vituperative comments, voted for him as a candidate for governor of New-York, to raise the question on Mr. Greeley’s patriotic endeavors before that time. As a lawyer would say, he is estopped. Others may not be. But the Republican Party of New-York State, who made him their banner-bearer for comp-troller since the war, are forever estopped to complain of his war record. Most especially are my honored Republican constitu-

ents forever estopped to plead Mr. Greeley's incompetence for federal position, by reason of his conduct previous to 1870; for they withdrew two of their unblemished champions to commit him to the sacrificial knife in the Sixth District.

It is nothing new to find a great name, or the envy of it, a stumbling-block to great results. When I read the one great idea of the Cincinnati platform, local self-government, on which depends the preservation of our government, I forgot the name of Horace Greeley. He was no bugaboo to frighten me from devotion to this Democratic canon. It is said that the Pharisees became partial to Christ when he defended one of their doctrines against the Sadducees. Without irreverence in the comparison, it is natural that Democracy should indorse the Cincinnati movement, when its capital thought is enshrined on the Democratic altar.

The charge of inconsistency can not come gracefully from a party whose President is elected in 1868 to ring down the curtain over the sanguinary drama of civil war. For he does it by the suspension of habeas corpus and bills of force against electors and committees.

CAUSES FOR THE NEW ALLIANCE.

Fellow-citizens, it is not an ordinary object that produces such an amalgam as we have considered. We have had coalitions in our politics as in other days and countries. It was only the other day that the Republican President of France found himself deserted by the "Right." He sought and was at once accepted by the Left. He preserved the republic. It is no ordinary crisis that calls out such alliances. What has been the occasion and cause for them this year in the United States? General maladministration? Is it neglect of salutary legislation? I answer, both. I reserve the latter subject for a startling catalogue of *laches* on the part of the majority, when I return my commission to my constituents. Is it because the aggressions of the executive, through his military and mercenary surroundings, have awakened the Republican leaders to a sense of their responsibility for foisting incivism upon the land in the person of our military President? Something of that, too. Is it absence from duty, nepotism, and personal government? Not altogether. I lay little stress on a presidential drink, or a presidential official relative. Casey may

have his receipt of customs at Orleans; Cramer may go where Hamlet's father went in Copenhagen; Leet may lift his loot and leave; Chorpenning may be sent to penitential exile with Creswell and his law firm; but these matters are as dust in the balance compared with the monstrosities of executive and legislative conduct, involving public liberty and civil virtue.

The better men of the Republican Party care less for these personal affairs, as the Democracy do, than for the aggressions which, beginning for war purposes, continue in peace for partisan and personal purposes, and which permanently threaten the structure and genius of our government.

All other reasons against this administration are temporary and trivial evils, to be tolerated and remedied. Whether it be through negligence or culpability, whether by blunder or crime, the fact remains, that there is a profound conviction that there are "fearful and formidable evils which have grown out of the misuse of official patronage," (I quote from my honored friend, Mr. Parke Godwin, in his unadopted platform,) "demoralizing, as it has, our whole political life, and turning the contests of parties, which should be a struggle for the ascendancy of principles, into a vulgar, ferocious, and corrupt scramble for the spoils of success." Still there is something more radically wrong, needing heroic treatment. We need reform in the civil service of a wider sweep and loftier purpose. The great danger is that which springs from forgetting the principle of Mr. Godwin. To quote again his own apt language, that we are not "a consolidated nation, nor yet a mere confederacy, but a composite democratic republic, in which the supremacy of the Union, the independence of the separate States, and the liberty of the individual are alike requisite and indispensable, each in its place, to the harmonious working of the whole."

THE DANGERS TO OUR GOVERNMENT.

On this indictment, I arraign the administration. This does not imply the destruction of the Union only; but of those arches of personal and State independence on which it reposes. If it be not the willful, then it is the ignorant and careless disregard of the very genius of our polity. When this is our settled policy, there is no Union worth having. There is no country but a chaotic, fortuitous, and temporary adhesion of States, whose liberties, fixed in organic laws, and even reserved and nursed by states-

men, courts, and people, are imperilled by the present misgovernment.

DESPOTISM AND GIFTS.

In view of this overwhelming issue, it is idle to discuss other questions of a personal or family nature. I have neither the inclination nor the skill to deal seriously with such matters. Unhappily, they are too current in our politics. Among them are two matters I do not wish seriously to discuss—first, the question of electing General Grant in the interest of himself and family; and second, his gift-taking. As to the first, I think we might allow the General to help his family somewhat, always provided the example does not harm and the family are competent. There is something akin to virtue in his helping his own. Blood is thicker than water; and who wants the government watered as bad railroad people water stocks! Besides, has not Mr. Conkling, or some other base maligner of the President, said that Grant had only appointed twenty-three relations out of our forty millions of people! But on this point I boldly answer in his defense, that he did his best. He appointed all the relations of the male sex he had; and is it not unreasonable to demand that he should “go back” on his nepotie, avuncular, and paternal relatives? How contemptible is the conduct of Gratz Brown, who only appointed his cousin, Frank Blair’s little boy, to a clerkship in Missouri! With such a large family as the Blairs and Browns to select from, and with such a competent and smart family too, the governor is worse than an infidel! A rumor obtained some time ago, that Mr. Casey, the brother-in-law, was to be dismissed from the collectorship at New-Orleans. A cry of horror arose among the people. What! Dismiss in time of profound peace, with his own hand, the brother-in-law of our chief soldier! Talk about Abraham’s insanity of sacrificing his own son, or the Roman vanity which condemned to death the best beloved. No such weakness afflicts our President. Mr. Casey remains to collect customs, and to kidnap legislatures! My impression is, that it is not of much consequence in Louisiana whether the Legislature is at sea or in its seats.

But it is charged that General Grant has been enriched by presents. That is a question between the giver and the gifted. If he appoints to office because of the gift, that is another question. But even then, does he not show a sense of gratitude? Is not this a beautiful trait? Simple Andrew Johnson refused a

carriage and harness. He had been reading up in our early republican history. What did Johnson know about the improvements in administration since Washington? I dismiss all such matters to cross-roads and cross people. They are trivial and temporary. The press and public opinion may correct the President, if wrong, and doubtless, if reëlected, he will dismiss his favorites, staff, and relatives. So of other matters of administration. There is constant complaint of military and other rings. It is suspected that custom-house folk have been gouging here and there; that swashed and bucklered parasites have been rioting in mercantile gains, to the annoyance of commerce. But these are mosquitoes. Let them buzz and nip. We can put up a bar to that. Indeed, Mr. Boutwell came near doing it, on the general order business, at my request in 1869. But something interfered, for which see correspondence and Mr. Boutwell.

There are charges rife of frauds and jobs of all kinds, and there is much proof. I am not fond of such discussions, though you will remember the Black Friday investigation, which fell to me, did not have a salutary result. I can not tell now fully why I could not get my witnesses, though I appealed to the committee to summon somebody else besides Fisk, Gould, Corbin, and Co. They refused, by voting down my resolution.

MERCENARY POLITICS.

These are mere mercenary matters. I wish there were less of them; for then we might have more hope of correction. You have read General Farnsworth's statement about stone quarries and the connection of public officers with such contracts. You know military aids to the President disburse money by the million in Washington for public grounds. You have read how our jolly sea-dog, Secretary Robeson, pays money out on Secor and other claims, already settled, by some new construction of law. You know how ships and arms are sold, without law, appropriations, or accountability. What the Post-Office Department and Mr. Earle, Attorney, have tried to do in the Chorpenning case, is already known. The attempts of an unscrupulous lobby to raise the contract price for railroading the mails, and a plan too successful, I fear; what attempts have been made to take great lots of land, valuable wharfage and islands, without compensation, by the President, when Secretary of War, and by Congress, for the benefit of corporations and banks; what the Custom-Houses have

become under this administration, and what the treasury, forever manipulated by scheming bankers who job and dicker on our credit, to the discredit of the government; what schemes lay hid in the St. Domingo job; all these and more, are they not fully understood by the people? and if so, there can be no question of the doom of the administration which fosters or permits and of the Congress which fails to ferret them out for their exposure and correction.

It is not my inclination to deal with such politics. I would not do it, if only for the honor of the country for whose union the sword of General Grant was drawn. It may be better for Republicans themselves to describe the situation of the President. Governor Blair, of Michigan, has said that it is impossible for General Grant, surrounded as he is, to reform such abuses. He says,

"Surrounded by an army of bold, brazen corruptionists, he is powerless as was Samson in the hands of Delilah. Nay, he flies from Washington like a beaten chief, with his horses and hounds, to Long Branch, to solace the lazy hours in the society of Tom Murphy and others such as he, while he leaves the Creswells and Robesons to their carnival of plunder. I do not here and now renew the terrific indictment of Sumner against him. That great statesman and pure patriot has spoken in his own way from a soul wrung with grief at the horrible demoralization of the public service, and he has said none too much. His great name and irreproachable character is a sufficient guarantee for every word he may utter. Of true Republicanism he was a founder and life-time supporter. Scorned now by office-hunting demagogues, he is still the best beloved of the people."

I hope that this is overdrawn, even as pictured by Mr. Blair and Mr. Sumner. If true, then what Junius once said of an English ministry may be applied to our Cabinet and its chief.

"Away they go; one retires to his country-house, another is engaged at a horse-race; and as to their country, they leave her like a cast-off mistress to perish under the diseases they have given her."

God help a country thus governed! Listen to another Republican! General Farnsworth, of Illinois, in his letter of August 6th, says,

"I have been a member of Congress thirteen years, and truth compels me to say that, during that period, the most wasteful and extravagant use of the public money and the least responsibility of those who have disbursed, have been during the present administration."

CINCINNATI PLATFORM ANALYZED.

It is not these matters which made me give my adhesion to the Cincinnati platform. It is a valuable code of honest politics. It is well worth analysis and consideration. All its nine points lead to one result. The rights acquired through the war should be respected, and those lost restored. Along with this, is the declaration against the subversion of the internal polity of the States. This is coupled with civil reform. The other points as to the sacredness of the public lands and the public credit, together with a welcome to all, irrespective of past associations, and a crowning resolution for the soldiers, make up a short creed of patriotic policy. Through it shines, like a sun, the Christian and humanizing doctrine of brotherly love. Every thought in this campaign will open upon this doctrine as a heavenly door upon golden hinges turning! In these ideas of reconciliation is not only union, but the sentiment which alone makes it possible, and keeps it permanent.

PHILADELPHIA PLATFORM.

Compare this with the Philadelphia platform. All that is worth having in it is a frigid appreciation and worship of a soldier. He is lauded as to his administration, in such strain as to make the platform a satire where it is not a falsehood. That platform ostentatiously exalts civil service. One need but read the sneering speeches of Butler and the inconsistent action of Grant, to know whether this be not both a satire and a falsehood on both Congress and President. Its denunciation of land grants, passed by Republican Congresses and all signed by the President, if not simple impudence, is a plea of guilty. It has a cry for the abolition of franking, which it never abolished. It brags of an Indian policy, which never fights the Indians into peace or civilizes them: a policy three times as expensive in 1871 as in 1860. Its demand for more bounty to soldiers is the cheap claptrap of a party which had the power, and did not use it, to "extend" the boasted boon. It butters words about the labor and woman question, like those about taxation and the debt. They are simply words to be construed by legislative neglect and executive indifference. Its affirmation about restoring shipping, in some future, when it has failed for seven years by reason of its Chinese policy, is only to be paralleled by the ironic hilarity of its devotion to citizens abroad, and matters of a foreign nature like the conspicuous Ala-

bama failure! The indorsement of two persons, the one a soldier and the other a Know-Nothing, is but a specimen of hero-worship, which stands in gloomy contrast with the enlightened policies and fraternal liberalities of the Cincinnati platform. But the climax of its audacity is attained, when it congratulates the nation on Republican devotion to amnesty.

AMNESTY.

Here I come to the leading point again. All efforts are in vain either to reform taxation or glorify our name abroad, either to honor the achievements of the war or make effective the new order under the amendments, unless the country is made strong and great by mutual love. To argue with the South about ordinary reforms, situated as it is, is to argue with a man about the components of caloric, when his house is a-fire! This platform wherein it says the Republicans have favored amnesty is "organized lying." The *Globe* shows that during seven years but a few of the Republicans voted for the general amnesty bills; and only lately did General Grant recommend or the Congress pass, the partial and imperfect bill they now pretend to claim as creditable to their generous foresight. I can show you forty instances of such hateful neglect or positive opposition. It was not until the threatened outbreak in the Republican ranks, that the President in his message recommended exceptional relief. Whenever Democrats urged it, it was tabled or hooted. The Republican portion of the Ku-Klux Committee did recommend, at the end of its report, both a further enforcement of the rigors of the previous Ku-Klux law, and as its accompaniment—Amnesty! If the South were bad enough for one, were they good enough for the other? They endeavored to hitch saint and sinner together, heaven and hell. Their claim to this anodyne as their specific, this balm to be poured into wounds which they themselves have kept green and bleeding, is only significant of desperation and hypocrisy. They present an olive-branch in one hand, and a sword with the other; the open palm and clinched fist; the kiss of peace and the dirk of revenge under the fifth rib. They confess, by offering amnesty, the wisdom of the policy of kindness, and with the other make hateful faces beneath their visor of affection. Sepulchres! without the decency of outside whitewash!

Mr. Speaker Blaine feels the force of this. He rushes to reply to Mr. Sumner. He is not the man to be made a pigmy of, even

beside his companion giant, Charles Sumner. But Mr. Blaine, with all his strength, does his memory and his tact and party wrong, when he tries to re-write the harsh measures of his party with a quill from the dove. He must remember that no amnesty in its fullness came from him or his; that amnesty in its odious partiality came only from his antagonist General Butler, and that this and other measures were bills of penalty and not of grace. On the 15th of December, 1870, I characterized one of these bills for "full and general grace, amnesty, and oblivion," as grace which was grudging, amnesty which was exceptional, and oblivion full of memories; a stormful Lethe; Hamlet, with the Prince and all out but the grave-digger! There has been no bill presented by the party in power, or passed, except the one which this description befits!

General bills were proposed. I proposed a bill myself. It was received by Mr. Blaine and his party with strenuous opposition; because, as he once phrased it, it would not do to antagonize the remaining war feeling of New-England.

Again Mr. Blaine, the best spokesman of Republicanism, (I will not say for him, of Grantism,) has apprehended that the new Congress elected under the candidature of Mr. Greeley, will fail to carry out by legislation the amendments. Oh! no, my honored Speaker! the constitution, *proprio vigore*, has saved you the anxiety of possible laws, not passed in pursuance with those amendments. With a facile Supreme Court and an amended Constitution, accepted by all parties, you need not distress your heart, that Congress is so omnipotent, even under the tattoo of your loud gavel, as to be able to overrule the amendments! The acceptance of those amendments in good faith by the Democracy, is what was not expected by you. But there they are accepted; and if there be good-will and healing in their clauses, this country will enjoy it so far as Democracy is concerned.

REPRESSION, NOT GRACE.

The main fault of the Republican policy has been that its measures have been repressive and not reconciliative. Its repeal of habeas corpus, and its military efforts against citizen and voter, are in direct violation of that peace so lavishly promised; while its local governments, the product of reconstruction and sustained by General Grant, are the odium of the time and the provocation to secret and open disaffection.

The laws passed to coerce elections by penalties and federal force are so much out of the path of a pacific polity that elections fail to be a choice or a relief; while the wholesome and ancient English law and custom which remove the garrison from the vicinity of the voting place are disregarded in the interest of party. The old and sensible provisions, that election judges and officers ought to be independent of the executive power, are also disregarded. All our elections, together with the qualifications of electors, are or ought to be fixed under State laws and conducted by local authority. But we know that, at the closing hours of the past session, it was attempted to force through Congress an amendment of the enforcement election law, so as to apply it to all places, instead of as now to cities of 20,000 people. The present law is an invasion of the constitution. Its extension as attempted would have been an usurpation on the part of legislature and executive to overawe and alarm the people in certain States. It would have provoked revolt; and when provoked, the result would have been heralded as an excuse for further military interference.

DICTATORSHIP.

It was a part of the plan to extend these repressive laws through this year. Already a dictatorship has been created in a law which happily was limited to the end of the past session. But that was attempted to be extended, so as to cover the presidential election. That law laid the liberties of the people at the feet of the President. At his discretion, and in any State or county, he could suspend habeas corpus; and in spite too of the constitutional provision "that the writ shall not be suspended, except where in case of rebellion or invasion the public safety requires it." Ay, in spite, too, of the ever-living spirit of freedom, which made the great writ, as Macaulay said, the strongest curb ever legislation imposed on tyranny. It is this advance toward absolute, personal government which has most alarmed the nation. What! Give this devotee of military power—this high officer whose messages are orders, and whose messengers are orderlies, whose every move seems to be inspired by barracks habits and camp life—give him, of all men, power to dispose of States and persons, to close courts, imprison at will, appoint military delegates to Congress, and suspend all law but his own? Have we come to this, that disturbances in nine counties in the one State of South-Carolina, which alone

have been thought worthy of the exercise of such dictatorial powers, should be the occasion or the cause of such enormous powers, upturning all rights of person and property? That for these disturbances, the country should be shingled over with military? We have indeed lost all the ancient spirit and landmarks if such attempts be not repressed by the people. I hold in my hand a paper of Boston. Its color indicates its age. It is dated March 12th, 1770. See these four coffins! They are the symbol of a *free* people, with death to the military officiousness which first provoked and then shot down the citizens of Boston. Did Boston rise? Read the proceedings! Public meetings and armed indignation everywhere—the forerunner of independence. The military were compelled to withdraw from the sight of that people. So it will be in November when a descendant of that stock will assure local government, and social and legal amnesty.

KU-KLUX PRETEXTS FOR FORCE.

I need not recite to you the pretexts for these audacious attempts to chain and throttle the people. Ku-Klux was the cry. It was squawked so loudly that a committee was raised to ascertain its extent. No Democrat favored such klans or societies. I was upon that committee, and my name is to the minority report. While such local disturbances could and should be properly and legally disposed of by "home rule," instead of federal interference, still it was thought best to examine the matter. The result was a vast mass of printed matter. It is too unwieldy to use. Some things appear from it: that there was an unqualified admission that there were no disorders in Virginia, Florida, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana, more than one half the South; and consequently no concerted outrage. As to the other States, there was not perfect accord of judgment; but it was agreed generally that the disturbances and secrecy were limited to a few localities in certain portions of other Southern States. Thus limited, and denounced by both parties, these outrages were made the pretext of a general military dictatorship over all the land.

CAUSES OF OUTRAGE.

I thought it would be well to inquire into the causes of such limited discontent. Accordingly I offered a resolution to ascertain the character of the administrations in the Southern States.

I especially wanted to know authoritatively the debts and taxes which had been heaped upon these people under their reconstructed governments. At first my resolution was voted down. Finally it was passed. It was no easy task to ascertain from interested and unwilling sources the facts so necessary to ascertain the causes of discontent. You have, however, in the press and from speakers, the result of my resolution and of our investigation. The debts of the Southern States before the war were \$76,415,890. At present, they are \$291,626,015. The total debt of the other and richer twenty-seven States is only \$203,872,552. This is commentary enough.

As to taxes, go to Arkansas, with two thirds of her acres under the hammer for delinquent taxes; or to South-Carolina, where of the four millions collected this year, being ten times the amount before the war, not a cent remains. It is estimated that in that State alone sixteen millions have gone to fatten its black and white harpies. Nothing in shape of canal or railroad, asylum or school-house, remains to show for it; not even the few sand-hills and swamps, bought in by State commissioners, which do not sell cheaply at small interest and long pay. The public institutions are closed, all but the penitentiary. There seemed to be a lasting need for that.

Is it necessary for me to show how such things became possible and are yet continued? First, the bayonet was at the throat of the white race; second, their suffrage was fraudulent, forced, and uncultured. The intelligence of the State was discarded. The elements of fraud and force, by vote and sword, have been upheld for party purposes by this administration. Are you surprised, therefore, when you read of secret and open disorders? Do you not, while denouncing them, feel like removing their cause?

Do you wonder that estates find no purchasers? That immigration shrinks away from the South? That bitterness and uncertainty prevail? Do you wonder that taxes have increased ten times? That Southern bonds are a drug in the market? That the people lose their spirit between the millstones of adventurous rapacity and ignorant suffrage? That enterprise dies, and the number of tilled acres gradually diminish? With all these evidences of decay, fraud, and misrule, do you wonder that, to seek relief from this organized belevilment and blighting curse, to have Ku-Kluxing stopped and military rule displaced, the great bulk of the Southern people demanded that a fair

Republican should, for his appreciation of their condition, be made their elected saviour? Or that the Democracy, faithful to civil order and mutual sympathy, accepted Horace Greeley? Or that a great body of one party, and the whole of another, should visit the indifference of the federal executive to the maladministration of affairs South with their patriotic vengeance, while lifting up above all party the white, unseamed banner of peace and love? It is not so much now that we can reach the fleeing Bullocks, nor evict the Scotts, Davises, Holdens, and Claytons who have reveled in plunder. It is not now that we can reform these peculiar and pernicious practices which find their example in higher quarters. It is too late for the Orrs of South-Carolina to endeavor to save General Grant by his bolt from the scoundrels who have ravaged that State. Nor do I care how many presidential relatives hold office. Nor so much that we may economize the expenses of the administration; or make a better tariff; or teach Mr. Dawes better figures as to the comparative expenses of 1860 and 1871, so as at least to correct him to the amount of \$52,468,000. Nor is it so much to show how good a government may be made with the honest men of both parties at work. It is not so much to condemn the corruptions of this administration in the Treasury, Post-Office Department, or Navy. It is not that we will investigate these matters in full time. It is not to stay the tide of luxury and extravagance, which has Washington for its source and illustration. It is not so much to tear from the body of the government the bloated leeches called the syndicate, who, in placing our loan, got at the least one and a half millions more than the law allowed, for placing on the market the sum of \$200,000,000 of the five per cents. It is not one but all of these objects to be attained by that reform which is only possible under other political conditions. But it is more than these. The election of the Liberal Democratic candidate means this: Take the bayonet away; clean out the swarms which infest the offices of the South; no more suspension of habeas corpus; no dictator; but above all, as the panacea and result, mutual good-will and amnesty, and the restoration of the form and spirit of our system of government.

These are the main features of our policy, and these the signs of its success. This end is partially attained by the simple disruption of party ties; nay, by the very candidature, if not the success, of Greeley and Brown.

VICTORY OF THE REPUBLIC, NOT PARTY.

If the victory be a Democratic or a Republican victory, or both, let it be a victory for the republic! I know that, to excite prejudice, the Republican organs, like the *Times* of New-York, declare that Mr. Greeley's victory will be a Democratic victory. If so, why do they propose to Democrats to desert the conventional nominee, Mr. Greeley? And why should a Democrat do so? It is also said that Mr. Greeley's election will inevitably lead to a congressional Democratic majority. If it should, and full amnesty would result, who should complain? Not Democrats.

Whether Democracy be only the "mended and frayed strand" of its old tissue, or the Republicans be as dry and marrowless as the bones of Ezekiel, is not so much a matter, as a change in administration, conducted by honest and efficient men. To this result, the Democracy have sacrificed much, and will sacrifice more. They remember that their nominee, Mr. Greeley, ever since Lee's surrender, has been a friend of reconciliation. They remember how he denounced the blockheads of the Union League, who endeavored "to base a great enduring party on the hate and wrath engendered by a bloody civil war, as no better than planting a colony on an iceberg which had drifted into a tropical ocean!" They remember that, while in the heat and dust of other strifes, he has not spared them; yet, in generous rivalry, he has endeavored with them to pursue the paths of peace. With a life of unusual activity, a pen of masculine vigor, a mannerism not at all lacking in the simplicity needed in high places—coming from the people as a poor and friendless but brave boy, into the heart and swirl of the great metropolis—he has left his impress on this country. He will, under God, impress his administration with sentiments mellowed by new associations, with charities silvered over by advancing years, and with a reverence for the hallowed traditions of our early national career, made glorious by that Democracy which has in the vicissitudes of parties become his ally in that progress, and a sharer in the common blessings and glories which his administration will bestow.

In conclusion, the climax of those blessings will come to our country, because they will be inspired by the doctrine of reconciliation. It is the principle of loving and being loved, of lov-

ing Him because He first loved us; of pardon which is without reserve, that which forgives its enemy and prays for those who despitefully use you; the doctrine not of the Christian only, but of the Hebraic, and even heathen religions; the doctrine of peace on earth and good-will to men, chanted by the angelic choir upon the advent of the Prince of Peace. Whoso fights a party thus inspired, fights with a straw against a champion cased in adamant. We know whence our strength cometh in this struggle. It is not from below. The refusal to clasp hands is not from on high. We draw our light from the mountain which is so "set apart" that its name is known only from the great sermon of our Master upon its summit. Not from Ararat, which lifted its head first above the flood; not from Sinai, the unwasting monument of the law given to Israel; not from Horeb, where even the Almighty covered the human face which might look on his brightness, with his fearful hand; not Tabor, where the wondrous scene of the transformation was enacted; not from Pisgah, where Moses made his touching farewell to the people he had led; not from Carmel, where the prayer of Elijah was answered in fire; not Lebanon, whose cedars are the beauty of the earth; nor from Zion, whose story is the very pathos of the soul of desolation and song; not the Mount of Olives, which saw the agony of the Saviour; nor Calvary, at whose great tragedy nature shuddered and hid her face in gloom; but from that nameless mount whose sermon gave to man the sweet code of Love, Gentleness, and Forgiveness. He who spake as never man spake said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

From this we draw our teaching. God and time will help us to carry it into our political ethics. Upon those who *protest* against it, and who refuse forgiveness to others, my only curse is, that they may know what it is to be forgiven; and my prayer is, that God may forgive them, for they know not what they do.

the

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 524 9

permalife®
pH 8.5